

## **REMARKS**

Claims 1-20 are currently pending. In the June 6, 2007 Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 11-18 under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter, but indicated that the rejection could be overcome by including a “computer readable medium encoded with a computer program” limitation in the claims. In addition, claims 1, 2, 4-6, 8, 10, 11, and 13-14 and 16-18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,473,607 to Shohara et al. (“Shohara”); claim 3 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shohara in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0028677 to Fukuhara (“Fukuhara”); claims 7, 12 and 19-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shohara in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,622,251 to Lindskog et al. (“Lindskog”); and claims 9 and 15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shohara in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0059434 to Karaoguz et al. (“Karaoguz”). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections for the reasons set forth hereinbelow.

### **A. Claims 11-18 Recited Statutory Subject Matter**

In response to the Examiner’s rejection of claims 11-18 under 35 U.S.C. § 101, Applicants have amended the claims as suggested by the Examiner, and therefore respectfully request that the statutory subject matter rejection of claims 11-18 under 35 U.S.C. § 101 be withdrawn and that the claims be allowed. Because this amendment is submitted to comply with a requirement of form set forth in the previous Office Action, Applicants submit that the amendment is permitted under 35 CFR § 1.116(b)(1).

### **B. Claims 1, 2, 4-6, 8, 10, 11, 13-14 and 16-18 Are Not Anticipated by Shohara**

In response to the Examiner’s previous rejection of claims 1, 2, 4-6, 8, 10, 11, 13-14 and 16-18 under 35 U.S.C. § 102 as being anticipated by Shohara, Applicants explained that Shohara fails to disclose an “instruction pipeline circuit,” much less Applicants’ scheme for using detected sleep instructions and wakeup signals to selectively power down and reactivate processing modules in the instruction pipeline circuit only to the extent required by the sleep instruction and the wake-up signal. To underscore this deficiency, Applicants pointed out that the word “pipeline” never appears in Shohara, and was not disputed by the Examiner. In the Final Office Action, the Examiner responds to this deficiency by proposing

an unreasonably broad and wholly unsupported definition of “instruction pipeline” and then asserting that Shohara meets this overbroad definition. In particular, the Examiner asserts that “any circuit that carries out instructions (i.e. control information) to other components through channels (i.e. connections) can be considered an instruction pipeline given the broadest responsible (sic, reasonable) interpretation.” Final Office Action, p. 9 (June 6, 2007). With all due respect, this is simply not a reasonable interpretation of the “instruction pipeline” term. As explained more fully below, when the *proper* interpretation of the “instruction pipeline” term is used, Shohara simply does not meet the requirements of the claims.

### **1. Correct Interpretation of “Instruction Pipeline”**

According to the MPEP Guidelines, the pending claims must be “given their broadest reasonable interpretation consistent with the specification” during patent examination. *See*, MPEP § 2111. This was confirmed with the Federal Circuit statement that:

The Patent and Trademark Office (“PTO”) determines the scope of claims in patent applications not solely on the basis of the claim language, but upon giving claims their broadest reasonable construction “in light of the specification as it would be interpreted by one of ordinary skill in the art.” *In re Am. Acad. of Sci. Tech. Ctr.*, 367 F.3d 1359, 1364[, 70 USPQ2d 1827] (Fed. Cir. 2004). Indeed, the rules of the PTO require that application claims must “conform to the invention as set forth in the remainder of the specification and the terms and phrases used in the claims must find clear support or antecedent basis in the description so that the meaning of the terms in the claims may be ascertainable by reference to the description.” 37 CFR 1.75(d)(1).

*Phillips v. AWH Corp.*, 415 F.3d 1303, 1316, 75 USPQ2d 1321, 1329 (Fed. Cir. 2005).

Thus, “the broadest reasonable interpretation of the claims must also be consistent with the interpretation that those skilled in the art would reach.” *In re Cortright*, 165 F.3d 1353, 1359, 49 USPQ2d 1464, 1468 (Fed. Cir. 1999). “This means that the words of the claim must be given their plain meaning unless the plain meaning is inconsistent with the specification.” *In re Zletz*, 893 F.2d 319, 321, 13 USPQ2d 1320, 1322 (Fed. Cir. 1989). “The ordinary and customary meaning of a term may be evidenced by a variety of sources, including ‘the words of the claims themselves, the remainder of the specification, the prosecution history, and extrinsic evidence concerning relevant scientific principles, the meaning of technical terms, and the state of the art.’” MPEP § 2111.01, *citing Phillips v. AWH Corp.*, 415 F.3d at 1314, 75 USPQ2d at 1327.

Based on the foregoing, Applicants submit that the “instruction pipeline” refers to a processing structure that separates the execution of instructions into multiple stages (e.g., instruction fetch, instruction decode and operand read, execution, and write), and executes separate instructions in each stage simultaneously, thereby allowing multiple instructions to be executed concurrently. As depicted in the present application, each stage simultaneously processes its assigned set of signals, and then forwards the results of the processing to the next stage and receives from the prior stage the results of the prior stage’s processing. The resulting overlap of operations by each stage increases the overall throughput of the processor structure. Applicants’ proposed interpretation is consistent with the specification as it would be interpreted by one of ordinary skill in the art. *See, e.g.*, Application, Figure 3 (“instruction pipeline circuit 140”) and paragraphs 30, 32, 33, 35-38 and 41. *See*, MPEP § 2111, *citing In re Am. Acad. of Sci. Tech. Ctr.*, 367 F.3d 1359, 1364[, 70 USPQ2d 1827] (Fed. Cir. 2004). In addition, Applicants’ proposed interpretation is consistent with the “ordinary and customary meaning” as evidenced by substantial extrinsic evidence attached hereto as Exhibit A, including Wikipedia’s definition of “Instruction Pipeline”; J. Silc et al., Processor Architecture, pp. 18-20, 349 and 354 (1999) (“instruction pipeline”); D. Patterson et al., Computer Architecture: A Quantitative Approach, pp. 251-252 (1990) (“pipelining”); W. Rosch, The Winn L. Rosch Hardware Bible, Third Edition, pp. 44-45 (1994) (“pipelining”); Microsoft Computer Dictionary p. 367 (3rd ed. 1997) (“pipelining”); and H. Messmer, The Indispensable PC Hardware Book, pp. 216-218, 1239 and 1250-1251 (4th ed. 2002) (“instruction pipelining”). If there is any reputable extrinsic evidence that supports the Examiner’s proposed interpretation here, Applicants would request that it be provided. However, based on Applicants’ review, Applicants’ proposed interpretation is consistent with the specification and with the submitted extrinsic evidence definitions which better reflect how one of ordinary skill in the art would interpret the “instruction pipeline” term.

## 2. Shohara Does Not Meet The Properly Interpreted “Instruction Pipeline” Requirement

As explained above, the broadest reasonable interpretation of the “instruction pipeline” term that is consistent with the specification (and confirmed by the extrinsic evidence) refers to a processing structure that separates the execution of instructions into multiple stages (e.g., instruction fetch, instruction decode and operand read, execution, and

write), and executes separate instructions in each stage simultaneously, thereby allowing multiple instructions to be executed concurrently. This requirement is simply not met by Shohara's disclosure of using an "event scheduler" to control reception of "scheduled intermittent messages" with a dual mode timer that uses different clock signals to power down all idle components during a scheduled power save sleep mode. Accordingly, Shohara does not anticipate the present invention's claimed scheme detecting a "sleep instruction" which is used to place the processing unit, instruction pipeline circuit and at least one processing module in a low-power state, and then reactivating the instruction pipeline circuit to the extent required by a received "wake-up signal." See, e.g., claims 1 and 11. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the anticipation rejection of claims 1, 2, 4-6, 8, 10, 11, and 13-14 and 16-18 be withdrawn and that the claims be allowed.

**C. Claims 3, 7, 9, 12, 15 and 19-20 Are Not Obvious**

In response to the Examiner's various obviousness rejections of claims 3, 7, 9, 12, 15 and 19-20, Applicants have amended claims 19 and 20 to present these claims in better form for consideration on appeal, and submit that the amendment is permitted under 35 CFR § 1.116(b)(2).<sup>1</sup> Applicants submit further that a *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been established showing that all the claim limitations are taught or suggested by the prior art. In re Royka, 490 F.2d 981, 180 USPQ 580 (CCPA 1974); In re Wilson, 424 F.2d 1382, 1385, 165 USPQ 494, 496 (CCPA 1970). First of all, claims 3, 7, 9, 12, 15 and 19-20 each include an "instruction pipeline" requirement (either expressly or by virtue of their dependency from claims 1, 11 and 19). As explained above, the broadest reasonable interpretation of the "instruction pipeline" term that is consistent with the specification (and confirmed by the extrinsic evidence) refers to a processing structure that separates the execution of instructions into multiple stages (e.g., instruction fetch, instruction decode and operand read, execution, and write), and executes separate instructions in each stage simultaneously, thereby allowing multiple instructions to be executed concurrently. This requirement is simply not met by Shohara's disclosure, either alone or in combination with the other cited references, of using an "event scheduler" to control reception of "scheduled intermittent messages" with a dual mode timer that uses different clock signals to power down all idle components during a

scheduled power save sleep mode. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the obviousness rejection of claims 3, 7, 9, 12, 15 and 19-20 be withdrawn and that the claims be allowed.

### **CONCLUSION**

In view of the remarks and amendments set forth herein, Applicants respectfully submit that all pending claims are in condition for allowance and request that a Notice of Allowance be issued. Nonetheless, should any issues remain that might be subject to resolution through a telephone interview, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned at 512-338-9100.

FILED ELECTRONICALLY  
September 6, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

*/Michael Rocco Cannatti/*

Michael Rocco Cannatti  
Attorney for Applicants  
Reg. No. 34,791

---

<sup>1</sup> Applicants respectfully submit that no new search will be required by the amendment since the substance of the amendments to claims 19 and 20 was already included in the original claims.